DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 508 EC 100 023

AUTHOR Kerins, Thomas, Comp.
TITLE An Evaluation of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute for Region V Educators of Gifted and Talented Children.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield. Dept. for Exceptional Children.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 80p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; *Institutes (Training Programs); Leadership Training; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Talented Students

ABSTRACT

Summarized in the report is information obtained at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute which was held for persons concerned with education of gifted and talented children in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The first chapter contains information on the participants and their backgrounds and interests. Chapter II (and the appendixes) describe the sessions of the institute itself. Contained in Chapter III is a collection of the participants' judgements of the institute. Chapter IV includes the evaluator's summary of the institute with final recommendations, which includes the suggestion that participants communicate with each other prior to the next institute. Appended material includes a list of participants, preconference and postconference forms, brief descriptions of the sessions, evaluation forms, and letters to participants. (IM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136508

Division of Supervision and Instruction

Department for Exceptional Children

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Gifted Children Section
Gary Hoffman, Director

ILTI Project Director
Sidney Slyman

Compiled by:

Thomas Kerins

Program Review and
Documentation Unit

2

EC 100023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction		1
Chapter I	The Participants	2
Chapter II	The Sessions	11
Chapter III	The Results	16
	Reactions at the Institute	16
	Reactions after the Institute	21
Chapter IV	The Evaluation of the Past and the Recommendations for the Future	27
	The Evaluation	27
	The Recommendations	31
Appendix A	List of Participants	33
Appendix B	Preconference Form	37
Appendix C	Postconference Form	39
Appendix D	Session Description	43
Appendix E	Session Evaluation Form	52
Appendix F	Letters to Participants	53
Appendix G	Delayed Postconference Form	77

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this draft report is to summarize and synthesize the information obtained at the institute so that any future training efforts can benefit from the successes and failures of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute (ILTI) experience.

This report is divided into four chapters. The first one contains information on the participants, their backgrounds and interests. The second chapter (and the appendicies) describe the institute itself. The third chapter containes a collection of the participants' judgements of the institute. The fourth chapter is the evaluator's wrap-up of the institute, including final recommendations.

The data collected for this report was obtained through various questionnaires, interviews, and observations by two evaluators. There was at least one evaluator present each day of the institute. Besides providing this summative report, the evaluators also provided formative or ongoing information to the institute planners on a daily basis.

CHAPTER I

THE PARTICIPANTS

A training institute was held in Peoria, Illinois from Sunday evening, August 11, through Friday afternoon, August 16, for individuals concerned or interested in gifted education in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. While the general goal for these six states is to provide leadership for gifted and talented education to individual school districts and consortia, the specific objective for Illinois was to plan, organize, and conduct a six day training institute for the purpose of extending training activities to meet the individual and group needs of approximately 30 State Education Agency and Local Education Agency personnel for the six Region V states. Before the description of this institute and its evaluation by the participants are described, an analysis of the events leading up to August 11 should be discussed.

In November 1973 representatives of the six states involved in this interstate project met in Chicago to discuss program format and budget details. A representative from USOE-Washington, Dr. David Phillips, presented information on the nature and purpose of Title V Grants and answered technical questions related to fiscal matters. Dr. Richard H. Naber, from the Regional Office of Education, acted as host and provided

background information on national efforts in the area of Gifted Education. Illinois, because of its years of experience in training, opted to run an institute for a team of individuals from each state. The teams would be composed of personnel who could act either as individuals or in associations as advocates, potential change agents for gifted programs on a local or state basis.

While the news was received in April that the projects of each state had been approved, it was not until mid-July that Illinois received official word that the money would be forthcoming. This is important to note because all the planning for the week long institute began only three weeks before the first meeting. The only information that had been collected up to this time was an assessment of the needs of each state representative -- a total of five individuals.

Each state began to choose its team members. As the list of participants (Appendix A) illustrates, there was quite a variety in both the number of representatives and their positions. For example, Indiana had only one representative, while Minnesota had ten. Michigan had only state office employees, while Wisconsin and Ohio had a mixture of local and state representation.

Apparently, in most of the states, the participants were chosen quite late so that it was impossible to do an adequate needs assessment for each individual. Also, in some states that did attempt to have a variety of representatives, "team" members did not meet until the dinner on August 11.

These comments are made to illustrate that the "core staff," the individuals who the Illinois State Office of Education had requested to

plan and run the institute, were forced to do some guessing on topics and procedures. The core staff, Don Mitchell of the Carthage Area Service Center*, Chuck Alkire and Bob Davis of the Peoria Area Service Center, were then in a situation of attempting to be flexible on one hand to meet the unknown needs of the participants and still hire consultants to make a specific presentation on a specific day.

On the pre-conference form (Appendix B) each participant was asked to state why they were selected to participate in the institute. The responses ranged from "I am president of the Wisconsin Council for the Gifted and Talented -- newly formed advocacy and education group for parents of gifted children and professionals in the field," to, "Designated by the state superintendent," and "?" In general, most of the responses indicated that the participants were actively involved in parent groups, local district or state office gifted program activities. The remainder were either state office representatives who may become involved in gifted education, depending on future state and federal legislation, or individuals who weren't quite sure why they were in Peoria. In any case, less than 20% of the above had an opportunity to express their needs to conference planners.

When asked about their backgrounds in gifted education, the participants gave a variety of responses. Ten had taken advanced college training in gifted education; several were parents of gifted children; six

* In the 1971-72 school year the Illinois Gifted Program instituted nine area service centers whose main focus has been based on the "social interaction" change model which sees change as a result of affecting the variables in which local school district personnel must operate. The ASC's have regional responsibilities to work with administrators and teachers in developing programs that mesh with the unique variables that each district possesses.

have had or now have local school district responsibilities; nine have taught gifted children; several now have state office responsibilities for gifted education and several others are involved in state associations for gifted education. Five individuals stated that they have no background in gifted education at all but are very concerned and interested.

Each participant then stated what they had accomplished to date for gifted education in their state. Although the participants did not fill this out as a team, and as was stated before, had often never even met each other, the following comments are grouped to give the reader a perspective of how each state was represented.

Michigan:

- Written several bills for legislature.
- Met with parent groups.
- Acted as consultant.
- Developed guidelines for programs.

Minnesota:

- Workshops across state.
- Went to National LTI.
- Member of advisory committee.
- Writing curriculum.
- Informing parent groups.
- Establishment of residential treatment programs for gifted adolescents.

Ohio:

- Developed state plan.
- Provided impetus for organization of six regional parent groups for gifted.
- Encouraged three school districts to employ a person full-time to coordinate gifted programs:
  a. locally established an identification process K-12;

b. developed program model at both elementary and secondary levels;

c. wrote and was funded for a Title III project on gifted;

d. conducted inservice for teachers and administrators;

e. published a bi-monthly newsletter brochure.

Wisconsin: Survey colleges to see problems; i.e., knowledge, level of administration and philosophical support.

Have made four rural schools aware that something should be done for their most able students.

Now that they are aware, our problem is to help them provide some kind of ongoing idea that will preserve and "jell" and make use of that awareness.

We are offering several courses at the university.

We have several intermediate service centers placing high priority on gifted funds.

Organized parent groups.

Written first draft of handbook for parents.

Am producing one hour TV special on gifted children.

Am currently writing curriculum for course on understanding gifted children.

Indiana: Only one representative was sent from this state. Although interested in gifted education, he has had very little exposure to actual programs or personnel involved. (Evaluator's comment.)

Illinois: The Illinois contingent was chosen in a slightly different manner than the personnel from other states. Since the Illinois personnel who could qualify as leaders in training and gifted program development were either the institute planners or session presenters, the Illinois State Office decided to select individuals who came from populous areas that had no local programs or districts that have a program with potential but need to "get off the ground." (Evaluator's comment.)

On the pre-conference form the participants were asked what they thought they could accomplish for gifted education in their own state during the 1974-75 school year. Almost unanimously they stated their goal was to establish awareness of the needs of gifted and talented children among parents, teachers, local and state level administrators. This awareness was to be transmitted through local inservice training, statewide parent meetings, internal advocacy by state education agency staff, and by discussions with state legislators.

The participants were then asked about their expectations for the institute...how they thought their one week institute could aid them in working for gifted education. The responses are grouped by state.

Illinois:	Help to develop a sense of direction for implementing gifted programs.
	Get insight into a workable program for evaluating gifted programs.
	Overview of gifted education and program schedule.
	It will give me a perspective regarding the structure and working of an ideal gifted program.
Indiana:	Improve understanding of gifted education.
	Establish continual relationships with other states.
Minnesota:	Aids in various techniques for selection, evaluation of program activities.
	Ways of achieving school board, parent, and teacher support.
	I hope to gain some idea of what other states are doing and broaden my knowledge of the gifted child.
	Expect to become aware of latest developments in field of gifted.
	Information which would help us in passing legislation -- strategies, techniques, etc., plus current research regarding the needs of gifted.

Knowledge to help plan a gifted program and materials to take back to staff member.

I expect to learn about successful programs and what the process is in getting started -- what pitfalls to avoid.

I personally am anticipating a significant first person motivation.

We have been charged by the State Advisory Board to make recommendations (evaluate) the Minnesota state plan from the North Carolina LTI. Also, we have been asked to make a report to the State Board of Education.

Ohio: Information for inservice and program.

To receive strategies, techniques which may be adapted to assist in the development of the Ohio plan.

Provide practical ideas for programming at the local level.

Establish contacts for future interchange of ideas, materials, etc.

Offer viable ways to sell gifted education politically so that adequate funding is forthcoming.

Michigan: Increased awareness of activities in which other states are involved with the hope of replicating such programs in Michigan in the near future.

Basic information on gifted -- I'm starting awareness of what other states are doing.

Am particularly interested in evaluation of programs.

Wisconsin: I expect:

a. knowledge about legislative process;

b. knowledge about role of parents;

c. Structure of the Intellect model;

d. knowledge of evaluation models;

e. knowledge of current research.

Gain awareness of strategies and programs for the gifted.

I hope to be reminded of the many different successful approaches various states are presently using.

I hope to learn of the present needs and problems Wisconsin has with regard to gifted programs as assessed by Wisconsin people.

"Hands on ideas" concerning the place to start with a hypothetical case -- one student in high school.

Two things: Some ideas on how to get through conservative attitudes, includes taking an idea through administrator and structures to get it going (teacher level). Some practical ideas on development, funding, and evaluation of schemes or programs...especially for small, poor schools.

Now that the participants' expectations have been illustrated, the next logical questions are (1) Were their expectations met? (2) If the expectations were not met, was it because the expectations were unrealistic? The responses on the post-conference questionnaire (Appendix C) showed that 22 of 26 respondents (85%) believed that their expectations had been met. The others either did not answer or gave ambivalent answers; i.e., sometimes, yes and no. Some of the comments of the few who were not completely satisfied are recorded below.

Sometimes: I think according to the program description, some of the sessions that could have been useful to me weren't.

A great range here in quality of presentation.

Yes and No: The sessions and institute were helpful, but I would have hoped for a clearer definition of our "task" in coming to this institute.

With the amount of time we had and the amount of material to be covered, my expectations may not have been realistic, but moderators could have done a better job, I believe, in bringing out overall themes, strengths, weaknesses, etc.

On the other hand, the vast majority thought the core staff had accomplished the task of meeting the participants' needs. A sample of their comments follow.

> Have attended TAG regional conference, CEC in New York -- many workshops but this institute really "put it together" for me.
>
> These sessions (overall) have caused me to ask questions of myself and stimulate ideas.
>
> I did not expect to become knowledgeable. I was more concerned with finding out (1) where Illinois was at; (2) whether they were prospering; (3) what things they were not doing well; (4) what that tells me, (5) what I should be doing. The last item was solved in my mind. The first item registered and Illinois is not a model for me to be emulating.

CHAPTER II

THE SESSIONS

As was stated in the previous chapter, "There was a range in quality of presentation." Also, there was a range in the relevance of sessions because of the varied needs, levels of experience and interests of the participants. To understand the goals for each of the sessions, the reader should refer to Appendix D.

A participant observer was present for the majority of the sessions. In addition, the participants filled out a brief questionnaire (Appendix E). A commentary describing the reactions of the participants in each session is contained in a letter sent to each presenter. A copy of each letter is included in Appendix F.

On the last day of the institute, each participant was asked to give a summary rating of the individual sessions that he or she attended. Table 1 gives the reader a basis for seeing how the participants compared the sessions.

In addition, each participant was asked to circle the letter of the three sessions that were most helpful. The two easy winners were the legislative panel sessions which gave participants ideas on how to effectively communicate with their legislators and the ASC panel session which discussed training processes in urban and rural settings. At the bottom in utility were the sessions on federal plans (probably because earlier information had been presented to the participants), professionals' organizations, and the reimbursement panel on local district programs.

In order to determine if the individual sessions have assisted you in meeting your individual needs so that you may be able to develop or strengthen gifted programs in your state, please rate the utility of the following sessions.

TABLE 1

Presenters	Topic	Very Useful	Of Some Use	Did Not Meet My Needs At All
A) Youngs	Structure of Intellect	10	11	6
B) Hageman	Open Classroom	8	11	6
C) Alkire	Role of Parents	9	13	3
D) Kerins	Evaluation	7	15	3
E) Davison	Innovations	9	11	1
F) Ferrell	Multi-Talent	11	8	2
G) Boudine & Stark	Teacher Training	6	6	3
H) Maker	Federal Plans	3	9	1
I) Bodine	Gifted Classroom Alternatives	8	10	4
J) Ferrell	Inservice Models	11	6	-
K) Campbell	Gifted Organizations	4	6	6
L) Campbell	Program Implementation	9	9	2
M) ASC Panel	Working With Teachers	20	7	1
N) Reimbursement Panel	Local Programs	5	9	7
O) Walker	Georgia Plan	9	6	4
P)	Legislative Panel	23	4	-

Circle the letter of the three sessions which were most helpful to you.

If a participant marked "of some use" in his summary rating, an opportunity was provided for the participant to offer suggestions for improvement. The comments are quite interesting because they point out the need for some of the participants for straight input and their impatience with what they considered to be too much discussion.

> Several of the sessions wandered "off target."
>
> Need for more specificity and direct application to programs for the gifted.
>
> In a lot of the sessions the leader allowed one or two people to lead them off.
>
> Not enough direction or structure.
>
> Direction sometimes drops out in interaction process; getting people to ask questions is one thing, but "burping" out isn't always productive.
>
> Generally, by providing presentations at an implementation or acceptance level rather than an awareness level.

Since the evaluation unit was in the unique position of evaluating the institute and presenting a session on evaluation for the participants, it is possible to provide some responses to the above criticisms. From our point of view, the above comments are accurate -- many of the sessions were cursory, free flowing, apparently directionless. Some participants claimed that the presenters were unprepared; this was at times true but only in the sense that the presenters were unprepared for the degree of sophistication of their session audience.

For example, the evaluation session came out average in terms of ratings but some participants were disappointed because they weren't given a "model" -- "The evaluators tend to evade questions by responding with another question." They were disappointed because there hadn't been

more lecture. While this is a legitimate comment, the presenters of this session and others such as the Structure of the Intellect, The Open Classroom, etc., were in the position of trying to give an hour and a half slice out of a topic that could take at least a semester to adequately discuss. In the evaluation session the plan was to distribute handouts which discussed the points to consider in conducting all manner of evaluations. The session then attempted to utilize examples from the participant's own problem areas as a focus. In the mornings, the discussion centered around the cognitive domain. In the afternoon, it was the affective domain. While an attempt was made to manage individual differences by breaking down the afternoon group into teacher and administrative concerns, there was still obvious frustration because the dialogue was either away from their unique concern or too sophisticated or too simple. (Interestingly enough, the comment by one participant who is familiar with evaluation was, "Gentle direction...seemed to produce a feeling for the evaluation process.")

Planners of any future interstate institutes may want to take the above problem into consideration by offering "progressive" sessions on such topics as the SOI or offering an evaluation session for each state. It seems as if in many cases the participants were understanding in their comments because they knew the core staff and presenters had little time to plan, but their comments should have impact on future plans.

The concluding question under the session section of the post conference form asked participants what session could have been planned that would have beem of more assistance. The first general comment was that "Perhaps during Sunday, pre-conference period some serious attention

might have given to soliciting the thematic concerns of various key (as distinct from team leaders) persons in each state...a difficult task, no doubt." In the opinion of the evaluators, this was a good point, especially in view of the lack of knowledge everyone had about everyone's concerns -- even those of fellow team members. Eventually, by Wednesday evening, much of this had been resolved, but time was lost.

Two specific concerns that were stated under this question were the lack of relationship that many sessions had to gifted education and the superficiality of the parent component. With regard to parents, it was suggested that "representatives of state parent organizations who had been close to lobbying efforts or parents who have been successful activists in other organizational efforts" should have been present. Another commented she needed information on, "How do you go about organizing to get grants...how do you coordinate isolated parent groups...how do you go about setting up a permanent state office...hints for improving membership."

With regard to the question of gifted education, a comment was made that the institute concentrated on innovative education and not gifted education. "I was perplexed by a tone that ran through many of the sessions that seemed to suggest all children are gifted -- a humanitarian and egalitarian point of view (and maybe it's true), but it isn't a particularly useful point to pursue at a conference on the gifted." Another asked why wasn't there a session on "working with the highly intellectual gifted?"

CHAPTER III

THE RESULTS

Reactions at the Institute

On the post-conference form the participants were asked, "What other activities, besides the individual sessions, during the week helped them to potentially develop or strengthen gifted programs in their state?" Overwhelmingly, the participants said that the opportunity to informally meet and interact with others during meals, over at the dorms, etc., was invaluable in clarifying points and developing ideas. Also, the core staff created, "...an atmosphere fostering rapport and increased commitment throughout the conference."

The effects of the atmosphere and informal communication opportunities cannot be emphasized enough; these responses showed up on almost all of the questionnaires. The only suggested improvement was that the core staff and consultants should share the dorm facilities with the participants in order to increase the opportunity for informal communication.

The participants were then asked, "Has the institute as a whole helped you to potentially develop or strengthen gifted programs in your state? If yes, how?" the response was almost unanimously "yes.". The participants stated they had a new awareness of what gifted education is, some ideas on how to implement their new knowledge, and the motivation to move ahead. A sample of their comments illustrate this.

Political insights -- appropriate since I am a parent leader.

Provide an opportunity away from the office and other activities to focus time and thought to organizing an outline of needs objectives and specific activities.

My head is "fragmented"...ideas, strategies, directions are bouncing out...I don't think I'll rest easy after this.

Awareness of special problems in terms of legislation and the public.

Now have a skeleton for a state awareness plan... and know where to obtain the needed resources.

Am all fired up now to get back to Minnesota and get all of our LTI people in action!

I would certainly shout affirmative that the institute has helped me at the local level...it is too soon to evaluate potential state impact.

People who are in different states now have a mutual support system.

The many varieties of how a gifted program can be viewed that make school boards more receptive to programs.

Better understanding through exposure and a final "click" in the overall concept of the program and how it works.

The next question required more of a personal commitment on the part of the respondent since it specifically asked what he or she, "...can accomplish for gifted education in your state, particularly during the 1974-75 school year?" Of course the answer varied according to whether the respondent was a parent or an educator at the local or state level. However, one theme which seemed to cross all occupations was "applying pressure to the legislature," "laying groundwork for legislation."

Many respondents actually gave long lists of their proposed activities. It would seem that the institute had succeeded in encouraging the participants to think through their state's own unique problems. The comments to this question are grouped by state to give the reader a perspective of where each state plans to go in the area of gifted education. (Duplicating comments have been avoided.)

Ohio:

- Applying pressure to our school board and state legislature.
- Work on legislation.
- Develop and implement programs.
- Conduct inservice.
- Cultivate a strong state organization of parents and education.
- Establish communication networks throughout state.
- Extend statewide awareness activities.
- Begin state plan implementation.
- Provide a minimum of two programs for direct service to students.
- Provide technical assistance to school directors interested in developing gifted programs.

Wisconsin:

- Political network (different folks with different hopes).
- Set forth a philosophy -- which is more valuable than a selection -- definition.
- An alternative system to the SCA.
- Create awareness in public statewide.
- Dissemination of information statewide via a newsletter.
- Speeches to professional organizations.

Lay groundwork for legislation.

Development and implementation of university courses in understanding the gifted child.

Michigan: An increase in the number of funded pilot programs...increased visability for those projects now in operation.

Work with my colleagues on implementing our beginning stages of gifted programs.

Indiana: Basic groundwork laying.

Establish a position.

Internal/external information distribution.

Minnesota: I can set up a pilot program in my local district.

Hope to get an effective group of leaders organized.

Try to gain some cohesiveness in our state.

Most significant is the development for cooperative communications, purpose and direction among the many groups/agencies dealing with gifted and talented in our state.

Got a program going...that will not be only enrichment activities from many different districts that meet no guidelines.

Play a major role in passing legislation.

Illinois: I hope to carry my enthusiasm back to my school and allow it (cause it) to infect as many of our staff as possible in order to broaden the base of the gifted program in Illinois.

For our state I'm not sure. For our school district, a program for gifted children.

A much improved local program...I now have a total awareness of gifted education and will be a much better spokesman.

To provide the leadership to the staff to "go forward" with gifted education in my district.

Organize a program for gifted in my district.

The final question on the post-conference form asked participants what additional information they would have liked to obtain but didn't at this institute. The vast majority indicated that they couldn't think of anything more than what they had been exposed to. However, the comments of the participants can be grouped in four areas:

1. Kid participation... "When are we ever going to start including kids in program presentations, panels, etc.... it would have been interesting to have brought in gifted kids and plan a session around them."

2. Specific programs... "More on specific programs and how they were developed...process steps (how to) in relation to topics like program development, inservice and legislation...a clearer picture of how successful gifted program in other states has been, and their future plans and expectations."

3. Leadership... "We need leadership skills." (This point is well taken considering the expectations that people have for the 1974-75 school year.)

4. Parent involvement... "How to start and actively maintain parent support groups,...I would have profited from the opportunity to look at and discuss ways to organize parents, priorities in parent education, etc."

To conclude this part of the chapter dealing with the comments of the participants while at the institute, the final verbal statements made by each team leader during the last hour of the institute are summarized.

Wisconsin: This has been more significant than the national institute...that was full of gimmickry and too long. This meeting had the substance we needed. Now that we have learned so much, our goal is to increase awareness back in our state.

Michigan: In our state the legislature has made the press for gifted education because of parent groups not the State Education Agency. This institute has enabled three of our state office staff to get a feel for gifted and talented.

Minnesota: Participants were brought here to have an effect when they return; they are all potential leaders. We are now building a support system with each other.

Ohio: It took us a while to understand the subtle purpose of why a team came here. We are now enthusiastically going home with a plan of action.

Indiana: I'm here as a result of a very recent phone call. I need to keep in touch with you all.

Illinois: None of the Illinois people knew each other before the institute. We have now met fine people and made lasting friendships. We now have a broadened knowledge of gifted education.

Enthusiasm, knowledge, and the potential establishment of useful interpersonal communication networks were the by-product of the ILTI.

Reactions after the Institute

The two sources of data for this section are the individual letters that were voluntarily sent back to the Illinois Institute staff and the results of a questionnaire that was sent to each of the participants.

The seven letters were all positive in tone about the ILTI. The letters have specific examples of how they were instituting plans for changes as a result of the Institute. One team leader sent a note stating that "...the meeting was not only planned and managed well...but also provided many opportunities for me to grow individually." Another team leader "...appreciated the number of sessions, the types of resources (personnel) and their willingness to speak candidly with us." A third team leader exclaimed: "As a result of the week with you and your excellent Institute leadership, I am able to proceed with much higher levels of understanding and confidence."

Instead of relying solely on these spontaneous responses, it was decided to send a questionnaire to all the participants. As many studies, including the evaluation of the Illinois Demonstration Centers, have proven often the euphoria of the moment induces participants to exude glowing phrases on how a training session has given them great insight into their problems. Upon returning to their particular situation, however, participants often state that the reality of their situation has made the training mainly theoretical and very impractical to implement. Since the emphasis of this institute was to train hand-picked change agents to develop and or strengthen gifted programs it was hypothesized that these individuals would soon find out if their training has any payoff.

In order to obtain the data about the impact of the institute, a brief one page questionnaire (Appendix G) was sent to each participant two months after the close of the ILTI. Sixteen, or 55%, of the 29 participants responded in time for their comments to be included in this report. It should be noted that there was representation from all six states in the responses.

Fifteen of the sixteen indicated that they were still involved with gifted education activities in their state; the one exception stated that her State Office job had changed in focus. The Institute planners hoped that state team leaders would choose participants who would have a continuing involvement in gifted education; apparently, this goal was accomplished.

Question two asked everyone whether the ILTI was useful in furthering their objectives for gifted education. Fourteen respondents said "yes" while one indicated "no" and one just left a question mark.

The fourteen respondents who answered yes to the above question then had the opportunity to indicate whether the ILTI had any impact on the type of activities in which they have become involved. Thirteen of the fourteen indicated that this was the case. A sample of their comments indicates that these activities occurred in the classroom, local school district, and the state levels.

> We are trying to work through the State Board to get more funding for a gifted program.
>
> Your ILTI gave us a unity we now use within our state to further gifted education.
>
> I have used many ideas with teachers and in the classroom.
>
> Legislative and "political" efforts have been stepped up.
>
> ...Am now serving on the planning committee for the State Convention for TAG.
>
> I came away with renewed enthusiasm about gifted education. This knowledge and interest spurred me on to organize an active committee for our school system.
>
> Session with legislators at the ILTI helped me realize how quickly our state could move if the right people were contacted at the right time. Using the techniques and suggestions given by your men, we have contacted the right people and are moving very quickly.

Again, those participants who answered yes to the second question were requested to tell us if the ILTI had any impact on the degree of involvement in gifted education activities. Eleven of the fourteen stated this was the case. A sample of their comments indicates that the ILTI has given them the knowledge and confidence to be more actively and vigorously involved in gifted education activities.

> I am a more active participant. I can state my views and back up some of my statements with materials from the institute.

I am now more aware of how to motivate staff, parents, students, etc., in the area of gifted education.

I am a much more vigorous change agent for action to start some well thoughtout programs for the high potential students.

One participant, who was asked to be a consultant for the Parent Role at the National Leadership Training Institute for Gifted and Talented in October stated "...while I did not find anything on parent advocacy in your ILTI, I am certain that week's experience had an impact on me as a parent and therefore, my role as a consultant, and further, as a Parent Advocate." Another respondent, who indicated that "...the ILTI had no formal impact on the degree of my involvement" did state that the "...meeting with the members of our state's delegation for such a concentrated period of time helped...become more politically astute...it saved me valuable time and has alloged me to move as quickly as I have in my state."

All the respondents were then asked: In retrospect, could you have obtained any additional training or experiences at the ILTI? Eight of the respondents said they had no idea what else could have been offered at the ILTI, but seven did check the affirmative response. Seven of the eight provided helpful comments.

The opportunity to "rap" with all the fine consultants. These people should have been housed in the same dorm for more interaction of participants and presenters.

I would have benefitted from an advanced training institute ...possible two level institute could be designed.

I would have liked more concrete ideas on using Guilford's SOI model in curriculum areas.

Would have benefitted from a workshop on legislation per se: a look at other state's legislation, a study of tactics used in several states to obtain legislation.

> A chance to study several states' models for organization of programs...those that work and don't work.
>
> More activities geared to private citizen involvement in generating action for gifted programs.
>
> I would have liked to have had training/experience in your concept of the role of the parent and Parent Advocacy. I felt the panel discussion was worthless. Inservice is not effected through show and tell...I also feel you could have had at least primary training in the arts and humanities if we are talking about gifted and talented.

At the bottom of the questionnaire, each participant had an opportunity to make a general comment. Nine of the sixteen chose to write a final statement. All of these statements were positive about the opportunities and experiences that the ILTI offered them. Since some of these comments also suggested improvements, a sample are recorded below.

> Primarily it was valuable for me politically. However, I would suggest that at your next, you try to make it less of a showcase for the "Illinois way" (although that way is very good) and more of an opportunity to study various models for accomplishing gifted education.
>
> I would suggest that staff, resource people, and participants stay together in the same hotel, dorm, or whatever. Although I was able to get to know people by partying rather extensively, others more inhibited and saner than I did not have the opportunity to talk informally with many resource people. It was through these informal contacts that I learned most.
>
> For the amount of time you had to put together a conference of this magnitude, I feel you succeeded. Had we had the time and opportunity to have pre-conference materials, you could have structured your sessions knowing your participants -- their interests, their needs.

While there is little doubt that the ILTI needed some improvements and perhaps some new directions for the future, the 1974 ILTI had the desired impact on the majority of the participants. The last quote to be used in this chapter is one of the best illustrations of this point. The sole team member from Indiana, the state with the "least" in gifted

education, stated that "...a State Plan working draft has now been written, a special gifted consultant (an interim measure) employed, a study committee operating, plans underway...future looks excellent."

CHAPTER IV

THE EVALUATION OF THE PAST AND THE

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The Evaluation

The internal evaluation unit of the Department for Exceptional Children in the Illinois State Office of Education was asked to perf m several evaluation services at the 1974 Illinois Leadership Training Institute:

1) To conduct two one-and-a-half hour sessions for participants on evaluation procedures and techniques. The sessions would be an overview of practices which could be applicable at either the state or local level. (This part of the evaluation was discussed in Chapter II.)

2) To be available at times for consultation on various topics in evaluation for the participants. (Lack of enough staff time by the evaluation unit kept this activity to a minimum.)

3) To provide summative evaluation reports which document the successes and failures of the institute as well as a description of all the activities and their impact. The evaluation would be disseminated to the Region V personnel, Washington staff and other interested parties. It would be used as one of the bases for future plans of such training efforts in Illinois. (This report will be the main summative evaluation; an abstract will also be written that will be made available for wider dissemination.)

4) To provide continuous feedback to the institute's core staff on how the participants feel the institute is progressing.

The pre-conference form, the individual session forms, conversations during the meals or later at the Bradley University Lounge, all provided the evaluators with means to act as a conduit of the participants'

attitudes and reactions about the ILTI. Of course, this type of evaluation is only effective when the staff conducting the training institute are really interested in the concerns of the participants. In this case, the core staff and the Illinois Gifted Program staff attempted to react to all the formative evaluation information as soon as they received it. Some concerns, though legitimate, were beyond their ability to correct, but in all cases they were anxious to know the needs of the participants.

The summative evaluation of the ILTI had to consider four factors -- the conceptual planning of the Region V state leaders and the USOE representatives; the interaction within state teams; the planning of the institute itself and its management by the core staff; and the summary reactions of the participants. The following paragraphs will touch on these four issues.

The idea of having such an institute is congruent with the goals of Region V for the development of gifted education. However, there are two areas of concern. First, the late notification that the money would be forthcoming effected the ILTI in many areas. There was not enough time to assess the needs of <u>all</u> the participants or to obtain information from them about their backgrounds, goals, or expectations. Nor was there time to provide sufficient orientation information; two-thirds of the participants were dissatisfied with pre-conference information. Of course, these problems made the actual planning and conduct of the sessions more difficult.

The second area of concern is the role of "team leader." The team leaders were the state representatives who had been the contact persons

and original planners for this six-state cooperative effort. In addition, they selected or were included in the selection of the participants on their team. However, in "putting the team together", some team leaders had a problem centering their focus and their goals. In other words, they and their members didn't have a clear idea of the role and responsibilities of the leaders. This problem apparently ceased to be a major issue by Wednesday evening, as the individuals began to meet and interact more as a team. One comment by a team leader was that he had a difficult time inducing one member to put her district's problems in second place behind the problem of encouraging the advancement of gifted education as a whole in their state. Perhaps time would have been more profitably utilized if the team members could have met before the institute to define common goals.

The planning and organization of the institute itself can be divided into two areas: the environment and the content. Over 75% of the participants thought that Peoria as a location was either very good or adequate. While one individual would have preferred a "major metro" location with more opportunity for outside activities, Peoria's diversions seemed to be sufficient without being distracting from the purpose of attending the institute.

The core staff anticipated that some participants would react negatively to the inconvenience of staying at the Bradley University dorm and traveling ten miles to the meeting location at Illinois Central College. However, this didn't seem to be the case. The travel time was utilized in either planning the day's activities or discussing what had occurred. The participants were told that this travel was caused by

the prohibitively high expense of renting facilities at Bradley. While both the meeting room and the dorm facilities were rated satisfactorily, the participants were definitely enthusiastic about the new ICC campus and at least accepting of the spartan living quarters. Even the dorm meals were quite acceptable.

The participants thought that the sessions were useful, that the number of options was sufficient and the core staff very good and helpful. There was some feeling that the sessions could have been focused on gifted programs instead of general innovation or individualized instruction and that if time had permitted, obtaining presenters outside of Illinois would have added an interesting perspective. However, the data indicates that most of the sessions and the ILTI as a whole were overwhelmingly successful.

Recommendations

Based on the assumption that there will be future training institutes sponsored by Illinois for Region V, there are several recommendations that the program planners may want to consider:

1. Selection of Participants

   Should the next institute be centered around a training effort for the same participants who attended the 1974 ILTI or should a new target group be selected? While the future sessions could invite back the 1974 participants, it should be

   a. for a shortened (two day) highly intensive and specific training session on one or two topics such as political action;
   b. as presenters;
   c. as state leaders for their teams.

   It would not seem to be the most effective procedure for the advancement of gifted education in Region V to concentrate only on the past participants.

   One of the evaluation reports on the Illinois Gifted Programs[1] suggested that the best way for the new programs to begin is the development of an internal advocate, preferably a teacher who also has administrative responsibilities. The 1975 ILTI might want to consider this type of local internal advocate as this target group and the 1974 ILTI participants as a secondary but still quite important linkage group for statewide initiatives. The local participants would be thinking primarily in terms of local programs but would have the opportunity to communicate with the state personnel who have a broader perspective of the statewide gifted program efforts. Thus a cadre of LEA personnel can be developed who can illustrate the benefits of gifted programs for their student populations.

   Regardless of the target group selected for the 1975 ILTI, the criteria for selecting these individuals as well as a strict timeline should be developed as soon as possible. Many of the 1974 ILTI problems stemmed from a late selection of the participants, thereby making the needs assessment and pre-conference information almost useless.

---

[1] Ernest R. House, Joe Milan Steele, Thomas Kerins, The Development of Educational Programs: Advocacy in a Non-Rationale System, Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois, Nov 1970

2. Preparation by the States

It would be advantageous for a communication linkage to be established among each state's participants prior to the 1975 ILTI. While it may not be economically feasible to have one statewide meeting, it may be possible to have the state gifted representative meet with the selected individuals on a regional basis. At least, a strong written communication link should exist so that half of the 1975 ILTI will not be spent on introductions. Each state team leader(s) will have to assume this responsibility, but hopefully each one will share ideas with the other state leaders.

3. The Institute

Assuming that the participants are selected in sufficient time for the 1975 ILTI staff to assess needs, the staff will have to plan the program around their needs. This statement seems obvious but there is always the danger that consultants who have had a great deal of experience in gifted education training efforts may have a set as to what the trainee needs and never bother to personalize their training efforts.

In addition, several participants were critical of the shotgun approach used in the 1974 ILTI sessions. Perhaps there are some areas of needs, such as identification or creativity, in which a sequence of training could be planned with opportunity for other options during the week.

4. The informal, relaxed nature of the 1974 ILTI enabled it to be a success despite the preplanning constraints. Suggestions made by the participants in the body of this report should be reviewed in order to even improve on this very important component.

The above comments and a thorough reading of the statements made by all the participants should provide future planners of such training efforts with helpful guidelines. Hopefully, in any future training efforts, the participants will be as thoughtful and generous in taking their time to provide feedback as the 1974 ILTI participants have been.

Appendix A -- List of Participants

LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE DIRECTORS

Illinois

Mr. Mike Castiglia
602 Tenth Avenue
Mendota, IL 61342

Mr. Robert Metcalf
10709 Lincoln Trail
Fairview Heights, IL 62208

Mr. David Moore
1439 North Kellog Street
Galesburg, IL 61401

Superintendent Jack Pierce
Peotone District 207 U
Peotone, IL 60468

Mrs. Barbara Rose
1505 11th Street
Lawrenceville, IL 62439

Indiana

Mr. Jim White
Department of Public Instruction, Indiana
120 West Market Street -- Tenth Floor
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Michigan

Mrs. Dorothy Brooks
Fine Arts Specialist
Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, MI 48902

Mrs. Carole Lewis
Experimental and Demonstration Unit
Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, MI 48902

Lee W. Quinn
Michigan Department of Education
Box 420
Lansing, MI 48902

Dr. Robert Trezise, Coordinator
Communication Skills Unit
Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, MI 48902

Minnesota

Ron Berk
106 Nicholson Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Karen Christopherson
Kindergarten Teacher
Robinsdale #281
4210 Cedarwood Road
Minneapolis, MN 55416

Tom Knauer
Assistant Superintendent -- St. Paul
3209 Windgate Road
St. Paul, MN 55119

Helen McLean, Team Leader
North End School
230 South Kipling
St. Paul, MN 55119

Donald L. Olson, Psychologist
Educational Service Area
Pipestone, MN 56164

Barbara K. Ross
[illegible]67 Gaywood Drive
[illegible]innetonka, MN 55343

[illegible]rs. Dorothy M. Ruth, Instructional Assistant
H.O. Sonnesyn School
3421 Boone Avenue, North
Minneapolis, MN 55427

Peg Sterrett, Counselor
6650 Vernon Avenue, South
Edina, MN 55436

Warren Zimmerman
Elementary Principal
Jefferson School
Rochester, MN 55901

Lizz Paul
3616 Woodcraft Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

Ohio

Nicholas P. Gallo, Educational Consultant
School Psychological Services & Programs for the Gifted
Ohio Department of Education
933 High Street
Worthington, OH 43085

Harry L. Scott, Educational Consultant, Pupil Services
933 High Street
Worthington, OH 43085

Joyce Van Tassel, Coordinator of Gifted Programs
Toledo Public Schools
Manhattan and Elm Streets
Toledo, OH 43608

Evelyn R. Taylor, Membership Chairman
Central Ohio Chapter, O.A.G.C.
590 Garden Road
Columbus, OH 43214

Wisconsin

William Ernst
Curriculum
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53702

Barbara Le Rose
An Early Program for Gifted Children
1341 Park Avenue
Racine, WI 53403

Jean McQueen
Development of Total Talent
1725 Main Street
Stevens Point, WI 54481

Fred Menz
Research and Training Center
Hovlid Hall
University of Wisconsin -- Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751

Jane Nolte
Wisconsin Council for Gifted and Talented
6833 West Wells Street
Wauwatosa, WI 53213

Appendix B

Name _____

State _____

ILLINOIS LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

PRECONFERENCE FORM

1. Why were you selected to participate in the institute?

2. What is your background in Gifted Education?

3. Have you accomplished anything to date for Gifted Education in your state? If so, what?

4. What do you think you can accomplish for Gifted Education in your state, particularly for the 1974-75 school year?

5. How do you think this one week institute can help you in your state in working for Gifted Education? In other words, what are your expectations?

6. In the space below, please write one educational concern for which you would like evaluation assistance. While being concise, try to focus the issue as well as you can.

Appendix C

Name _____

State _____

Position _____

ILLINOIS LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

POSTCONFERENCE FORM

In order to obtain information which could be used for future interstate training efforts, we need your insightful comments for the following questions.

1. How would you rate this institute's environment?

	Very Good	Adequate	Should Be Improved*
A. Peoria for a Location	____	____	____
B. Meeting Room Facilities	____	____	____
C. Dorm Rooms	____	____	____
D. Preconference Information	____	____	____
E. Thursday's Evening Session	____	____	____
F. Number of Options Available	____	____	____
G. Core Staff	____	____	____
H. Meals	____	____	____

If you checked "Should Be Improved*" for any of the responses, please use the following space for suggested improvements.

Postconference Form Cont'd

2. In order to determine if the individual sessions have assisted you in meeting your individual needs so that you may be able to develop or strengthen gifted programs in your state, please rate the utility of the following sessions.

Presenters	Topic	Very Useful	Of Some Use	Did Not Meet My Needs At All
A) Youngs	Structure of Intellect	_____	_____	_____
B) Hageman	Open Classroom	_____	_____	_____
C) Alkire	Role of Parents	_____	_____	_____
D) Kerins	Evaluation	_____	_____	_____
E) Davison	Innovations	_____	_____	_____
F) Ferrell	Multi-Talent	_____	_____	_____
G) Boudine and Stark	Teacher Training	_____	_____	_____
H) Maker	Federal Plans	_____	_____	_____
I) Bodine	Gifted Classroom Alternatives	_____	_____	_____
J) Ferrell	Inservice Models	_____	_____	_____
K) Campbell	Gifted Organizations	_____	_____	_____
L) Campbell	Program Implementation	_____	_____	_____
M) ASC Panel	Working with Teachers	_____	_____	_____
N) Reimbursement Panel	Local Programs	_____	_____	_____
O) Walker	Georgia Plan	_____	_____	_____
P)	Legislative Panel	_____	_____	_____
Q)	Evening Option (Mon)	_____	_____	_____
R)	Evening Option (Tues)	_____	_____	_____
S)	Evening Option (Wed)	_____	_____	_____

Circle the letter of the three sessions which were most helpful to you.

Were your expectations of the above sessions and the institute met?
Yes __ No __ If no, were your expectations realistic? Yes __ No __
Please explain.

If "Of Some Use" was checked, how could the session have been changed to make it more bereficial for you?

If "Did Not Meet My Needs At All" was checked, what sessions could have been planned that would have been of more assistance to you?

3. A one week institute can be much more than the sum of its individual sessions. Therefore, were there other activities or experiences during the week that helped you to potentially develop or strengthen gifted programs in your state? If yes, what were they and how did they help you?

4. Has this institute as a whole helped you to potentially develop or strengthen gifted programs in your state? If yes, how?

5. What do you think you can accomplish for Gifted Education in your state, particularly during the 1974-75 school year?

6. What additional information would you like to have obtained, but didn't, at this institute?

Appendix D -- Session Description

ILLINOIS LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

AUGUST 11-16, 1974

AUGUST 12th - MONDAY

9:00 - 10:15 a.m. - RECITAL HALL (PHASE I - FIRST FLOOR)

Staff Orientation and Needs Survey

Dr. Dave Jackson - Implementing A New Gifted Program

10:30 - 12:00 a.m.

Dr. Richard Youngs - ROOM 216A
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

STRUCTURE OF THE INTELLECT

A presentation on Guilford's Model on the Structure of the Intellect describes the components of Guilford's Model and how the theories can be used in a practical manner in the classroom.

Bert Hageman - ROOM 217A
Principal
Oswego High School
Oswego, Illinois

GIFTED PROGRAMS AND THE OPEN CLASSROOM (LOCAL PROGRAMS)

A presentation on how a progressive high school has implemented open classroom techniques for the gifted and talented student.

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH - PHASE I CAFETERIA
ROOM 207B

AUGUST 12th - MONDAY Continued

1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

Dr. Richard Youngs - ROOM 216A
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

Bert Hageman - ROOM 217A
Principal
Oswego High School
Oswego, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

2:30 - 3:15 p.m.

STAFF - ROOM 218 B

a. Handouts
b. Orientation
c. Logistics
d. Survey Results

AUGUST 13th - TUESDAY

9:00 - 10:25 a.m.

Charles Alkire, Director - ROOM 218B
Region III Area Service Center
Illinois Central College
East Peoria, Illinois

ROLE OF PARENTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF GIFTED PROGRAMS

Parents will share their points of view on how to deal most effectively in a school-community-state relationship for program development for their gifted and talented children.

AUGUST 13th - TUESDAY Continued

Tom Kerins and the - ROOM 216A
Exceptional Children's Evaluation Team
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois

EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESSES FOR GIFTED PROGRAMS

Participants will use Robert Stake's outline on how to conduct an evaluation to walk through examples of evaluation concerns that will be submitted ahead of time by participants. (Optional: the last half of this session can be broken down into small groups according to interests of representative participants if they feel it will be more helpful.) The purpose of this session is to give approaches and procedures which they can use in their own evaluation.

10:30 - 12:00 a.m.

Coordinating Staff - ROOM 218B

The coordinating staff will work with participants on beginning of implementation plans for gifted.

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH - PHASE I CAFETERIA
ROOM 207B

1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

Charles Alkire, Director - ROOM 218B
Region III Area Service Center
Illinois Central College
East Peoria, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

Tom Kerins and the - ROOM 216A
Exceptional Children's Evaluation Team
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

AUGUST 13th - TUESDAY Continued

2:30 - 3:30 p.m.

Coordinating Staff - ROOM 218B

Work with coordinating staff or presentation by participants

AUGUST 14th - WEDNESDAY

9:00 - 10:25 a.m.

Glenn Davison - ROOM 216A
Director of Instruction
Sun Prairie Public Schools
Sun Prairie, Wisconsin

INNOVATIONS FOR GIFTED

Action learning alternatives involving gaming and simulations appropriate for gifted and talented students, K-12. Participants will be involved in the learning experience utilizing examples of gaming and simulations appropriate for gifted and talented students.

John Ferrell, Director - ROOM 217A
Region VII Area Service Center
John A. Logan College
Carterville, Illinois

MULTI-TALENT: CALVIN TAYLOR'S MODEL

Multi-Talent Identification will explore how the concepts of Dr. Calvin Taylor can be used as a basis for identification instruments.

10:30 - 12:00 a.m.

Leo Baudino, Director - ROOM 218B
June Stark, Assistant Director
Region V Area Service Center
Urbana, Illinois

AUGUST 14th - WEDNESDAY Continued

INNOVATION AND MODELS FOR TEACHER TRAINING FOR GIFTED

A presentation on values and teacher involvement activities using the ADVISORY MODEL and LEADERSHIP TRAINING MODEL for teacher in-service. Participants will actively be involved in teacher training examples.

June Maker - ROOM 219A
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS FOR FEDERAL PLANNING FOR GIFTED

The session will include responsibilities, objectives, and programs of the United States Office of Education as related to gifted education. Also included will be status and provisions of federal legislation for gifted and how USOE can help you.

Dick Bodine - ROOM 217A
Principal
Leal School
Urbana, Illinois

ALTERNATIVES FOR THE GIFTED CLASSROOM

The presentation on a series of classroom alternatives for gifted and talented students in a variety of educational environments.

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH - PHASE I CAFETERIA
ROOM 207B

1:00 - 2:10 p.m.

Glenn Davison - ROOM 216A
Director of Instruction
Sun Prairie Public Schools
Sun Prairie, Wisconsin

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

AUGUST 14th - WEDNESDAY Continued

John Ferrell, Director - ROOM 217A
Region VII Area Service Center
John A. Logan College
Carterville, Illinois

TWO IN-SERVICE MODELS

Two in-service models will outline two separate ways of working with school personnel. The first - I-TRI - is designed to assist teachers to produce successful teaching techniques for gifted children. The second is called THE GIFTED COMMITTEE and is a process used by the Region VII Area Service Center to assist school systems to develop unified long range programs for gifted education.

2:15 - 3:20 p.m.

June Maker - ROOM 219A
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

Bob Campbell - ROOM 216A
Consultant
Marion, Illinois

UTILIZATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR GIFTED

3:30 - 4:30 p.m.

Leo Baudino, Director - ROOM 218B
June Stark, Assistant Director
Region V Area Service Center
Urbana, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

Dick Bodine - ROOM 217A
Principal
Leal School
Urbana, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

AUGUST 15th - THURSDAY

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.

Bob Campbell - ROOM 216A
Consultant
Marion, Illinois

IMPLEMENTATION PLANS FOR GIFTED PROGRAMS

Leadership in administrative and logistical planning for developing SEA and LEA programs for gifted and talented. Individual guidance for teams from each state in the formulation of a blueprint for actual implementation upon return to the home setting.

REIMBURSEMENT DIRECTORS AND TEACHERS - ROOM 218B
PANEL DISCUSSION

Panel participants will describe their local programs and will give information about the process that was used to develop their program. Emphasis will be placed on the types of teacher training that have most effectively helped the development of their local program.

10:30 - 12:00 a.m.

AREA SERVICE CENTER DIRECTORS - ROOM 217A
MODEL FOR WORKING WITH TEACHERS - ILL. REGION

A panel of four Area Service Center Directors will share various models of teacher training and program development used in the State of Illinois.

Richard Ronvik	-	Region I Area Service Center Chicago, Illinois
Charles Alkire	-	Region III Area Service Center East Peoria, Illinois
Don Mitchell	-	Region IV Area Service Center Carthage, Illinois
Ray Grinter	-	Region V Area Service Center Lebanon, Illinois

AUGUST 15th - THURSDAY Continued

Dr. Walker - ROOM 219A
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

GEORGIA GIFTED PROGRAM AND WORKING WITH METROPOLITAN SCHOOLS

An overview of what Georgia has done in Gifted Programming and how the State of Georgia has provided courses to meet the needs of personnel in local programs.

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH - PHASE I CAFETERIA
ROOM 207B

1:00 - 2:20 p.m.

REIMBURSEMENT DIRECTORS AND TEACHERS - ROOM 218B
PANEL DISCUSSION

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

Bob Campbell - ROOM 216A
Consultant
Marion, Illinois

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

2:30 - 3:30 p.m.

Dr. Walker - ROOM 219A
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

AREA SERVICE CENTER DIRECTORS - ROOM 217A
MODEL FOR WORKING WITH TEACHERS - ILL. REGION

REPEAT OF MORNING SESSION

AUGUST 15th - THURSDAY Continued

7:00 - 9:00 p.m.

INFORMAL MEETING WITH STATE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES
Bradley University
Student Union
Student Lounge
1st floor

AUGUST 16th - FRIDAY

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.

LEGISLATIVE DISCUSSION PANEL - ROOM 218B

Senator Bruce
Senator Johns

10:30 - 12:00 a.m.

COORDINATING STAFF AND DR. WALKER - ROOM 218B

RAP UP DISCUSSION ON LEGISLATIVE MATTERS AND DESCRIPTION OF ILLINOIS LOBBY ACTIVITY

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH - PHASE I CAFETERIA
ROOM 207B

1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL STATE TEAMS ON TENTATIVE PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING GIFTED PROGRAMS IN HOME STATES

2:30 - 3:30 p.m.

CLOSE OF PROGRAM BY COORDINATING STAFF

Appendix E

Name _____

State _____

Session _____

SESSION EVALUATION FORM

1. Did the speaker encourage group interaction or discussion?

   Yes ___ No ___

2. How familiar are you with the topics discussed in this session?

   _____ Very Familiar _____ Some Knowledge

   _____ Heard of It _____ Not at All

3. Was this session of the institute useful to you? Yes ___ No ___
   If no, why not? What was the session lacking?

4. Is the institute, in general, providing you with useful information?
   Yes ___ No ___ Not Sure ___ If "No" or "Not Sure", why not? What could be done?

Appendix F

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Dr. Richard Youngs
Illinois State University
Room 216A
Normal, Illinois

Dear Dick:

The following feedback information resulted from your presentation of Structure of the Intellect at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. The respondents and participant observers were in unanimous agreement that you encouraged group discussion. The climate you created for your session was in accordance with the intentions of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and institute staff.

2. The majority of the participants had some knowledge of Structure of the Intellect, while a few (three) were quite familiar, and about the same (four) had no knowledge of it.

3. The participants almost unanimously found your session useful. Sixteen participants in the morning session and eight in the afternoon stated this. Only one individual in each session stated it was not useful. The comments that participants made are quoted below:

   Gave me insights
   Brought up ideas
   Bibliography of materials
   Tried to cover too much too quickly
   Application for instruction strategies most useful later in the session as we got into application of this knowledge to the classroom and students
   Knew much of this already
   Really liked this session -- both a.m. and p.m.

The a.m. session was handicapped because of the late start. Your decision to run a progressive type of session seemed to meet with the approval of the participants, although several of the a.m. participants felt they were in a bind because they had to either progress with you or miss the open classroom session. Altogether, though, it seems that you accomplished your goal for the sessions, given the time constraints placed upon you.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Bert Hageman
7811 South Scepter Drive
Apartment #3
Franklin, Wisconsin 53132

Dear Bert:

The following feedback information resulted from your presentation of Gifted Programs and the Open Classroom at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. The respondents and participant observers were in unanimous agreement that you encouraged group discussion. The climate you created for your session was in accordance with the intentions of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and institute staff.

2. Most of the participants had some knowledge of the topic, but their written comments indicate that even this knowledge was at the elementary level.

3. The vast majority of participants found your session useful. Eighteen stated this was the case, four said it was not useful, and three thought it didn't apply to their needs. The responses were the same for both sessions so the time problem of the late start in the morning session didn't seem to affect your session. The written comments that the participants made are quoted below:

   Makes topic interesting
   Knows subject
   Setting like classroom...interaction would be aided through sitting in a circle
   Interesting, but very little new information; good reinforcement that such programs can be successful

A re-run of basic information, although it's interesting hearing how a local district implements a particular program. He touched only on the successes -- were there no problems?
Excellent example of usage of self-image concept working
Even though I teach kindergarten, it was interesting to hear what others are doing
Helpful if materials would have been available
Need more indepth presentation

Altogether, you seem to have accomplished your goal for the sessions. Some of the participants seemed to have higher expectations; they may have had the session title Gifted Programs and the Open Classroom and expected more of a survey of the latest techniques and programs instead of the presentation on a single case as was stated in your session abstract.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Chuck Alkire, Director
Region III Area Service Center
Box 2400
Illinois Central College
East Peoria, Illinois 61611

Dear Chuck:

The following feedback information resulted from your work as chairman of the Role of Parents in Development of Gifted Programs at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. All 23 participants who completed the form said that the chairman encouraged discussion.

2. A majority of the participants said they were "very familiar" with this topic, while the others stated they had "some knowledge".

3. Nineteen of the 23 participants said it was a useful session. Their comments are recorded below:

Felt everyone wants to deal with peripheral issues. I want to get the damn programs running and then worry about changing the world.
Too many people are not "ready" for parents. They are here man!
This was the most informative session yet.
Panel make-up could be different. Could have been interesting to have parents who did not have children in the Washington School!
Need more reactions from parents directly concerning their kids. What do the kids think of their situation?
Well done on an introductory level -- how about an advanced level? Could improve by bringing in some new ideas ..too much generalization without a data base to back it up.

> It is my impression that the panel appeared content to maintain the status quo. It would appear that they might be about the business of extending opportunities for greater numbers of children at the primary and senior high level.

As with many sessions, there were participants who wanted more "advanced" information. Their suggestions for different panel structures could well be utilized in future sessions.

If you have any comments on the panel discussion, we would be glad to include them in the final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Glenn Poshard, Consultant
Region VII Area Service Center
John A. Logan College
R.F.D. #2
Carterville, Illinois 62918

Dear Glenn:

I want to again thank you for assisting Connie and I in our evaluation session at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute. We thought you would be interested in the evaluation feedback for the session.

1. Twenty five participants stated that group discussion was encouraged; one said it was not.

2. The vast majority of the participants stated that they were either very familiar (seven), or had some knowledge (17) of evaluation.

3. Twenty three participants felt the session was useful while four did not. The ratio of ayes to nayes was the same for each session. Participant comments are recorded below:

I still do not know how to evaluate my specific subject area.
Session did not relate to scheduled topic.
It was useful, but did not cover areas I expected.
Very good.
Good dialog on a confusing area...it seems there are no simple answers on how to evaluate programs.
It might have been good to work through a "model" evaluation.
I liked the session and the discussion was very plesant. I personally felt that it did not deal with the hand issues of evaluation and objectives in a way that was highly useful to me; however, I think the discussion needed more input from the evaluation specialist.

Useful, but I didn't really acquire new information about evaluation of the Gifted.
To me, somewhat too unstructured. An interesting "rap session" but little in the way of concrete new information.
Need a lengthly night session to discuss fully SEA possibilities for evaluation.

As you know, we asked you to assist us in the session so we could have an evaluation perspective from a teacher working with gifted children. I think you did help some of the participants. However, as in many of the sessions, the presenters were forced into a general presentation to avoid such a narrow perspective that three-fourths of the audience would be turned off.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Glenn Davison
Director of Instruction
Sun Prairie Public Schools
Sun Prairie, Wisconsin

Dear Glenn:

The following feedback information resulted from your presentation at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. All 28 participants who responded to the form indicated that interaction and discussion were encouraged.

2. The participants in your sessions ranged along the topic familiarity range from very familiar (3), some knowledge (12), heard of it (5), and none at all (9).

3. It was almost unanimous; 27 out of 28 participants said it was useful. The one negative vote came from an individual who was already very familiar with the topic and was looking for further information. Below are the participants' comments:

   Well focused to needs of the gifted... very interesting...good overall involvement.
   Needed more time...would like to have worked through the simulation to completion.
   Excellent presentation.
   Good presentation of the topic...usable content.
   Too elementary...not strongly enough related to gifted.
   Excellent -- rather than telling, it was showing with the participants learning.

It seems that your presentations matched both your expectations and that of the participants.

If you have any comments to make about your perception of the session, we would be glad to include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. John Ferrell, Director
Region VII Area Service Center
John A. Logan College
R.F.D. #2
Carterville, Illinois 62918

Dear John:

The following feedback information resulted from your presentations at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

A. Multi-Talent: Calvin Taylor's Model

1. All 15 participants who completed the form said they felt you encouraged group interaction or discussion.

2. The participants ran the gamut on awareness: very familiar (2); heard of it (4); some knowledge (6); not at all (3).

3. Fourteen out of the 15 respondents said that your session had been useful. The only negative comment came from an individual who said he was already quite familiar with the topic and that your session gave him no new insights. Other comments were:

Not enough time...needed more focus regarding applicability.
Excellent interactor
Very fine presentation
Good materials

B. Two Inservice Models

1. Ten of the 14 respondents indicated that group interaction was encouraged.

2. While two participants were "very familiar" with the topic, seven had "some knowledge", and four had "no familiarity with it".

3. Twelve of the 15 respondents found the session useful. Interestingly enough, the three who found it not useful all came from Illinois; the other state respondents liked it.

Excellent...specific information...directly applicable...well organized.
Too many generalizations...no indepth follow through on specific examples.
Very helpful session...appreciate handout.
Too much material to cover in too short a time.

The questionnaire given to the participants on the last day of the conference confirms the data cited above. Your sessions were quite useful to the participants.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mrs. June Maker
Office of the Superintendent
of Public Instruction
1020 South Spring Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Dear June:

The following information is a result of your presentation at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. All ten respondents indicated that you encouraged group discussion or interaction.

2. Perhaps it was Jackson's speech, but most participants claimed they were either very familiar (three) or knowledgeable (six) about the topic.

3. All ten participants stated that the session was useful. The following comments were made:

> Learned several points I didn't know before.
> Appreciated handout...helpful information...
> well organized.

It seems that you did accomplish your goal of providing useful information to participants.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Dick Bodine
Principal
Leal School
Urbana, Illinois

Dear Dick:

The following feedback is the result of your presentations at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. Fourteen participants said you encouraged group interaction, while two said "somewhat", and three said you didn't. Two of these three individuals also stated they didn't want interaction; they wanted to listen.

2. While almost half said they had some knowledge of the topic, a high percentage (30% for this institute) indicated they had no familiarity with it.

3. Eighteen of the 20 respondents said your session had been useful to them. One of the "not useful" selectors indicated that a "tactless, unkind and nonproductive" line of questioning by one of the participants had neutralized the session for her. The following written comments were made about your session:

> Have visited a number of schools of this type...I don't see that the concept relates all that clearly to the topic of gifted students.
> Too many disruptive questions from the audience
> The session was good in spite of questioning.
> Personally interesting because my son will be in a similar school situation this fall. In terms of team goals, less useful.
> Slow start on concrete definition of alternative model -- good ending

This was a really practical session in
the detailed explaining of Leal school's
program.
Really informative...very exciting
Session not long enough for depth coverage

Altogether, though, it seems that you accomplished your goal for the sessions, given the time constraints placed upon you.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Bob Campbell
904 North Market Street
Marion, Illinois 62959

Dear Bob:

The following information is a result of the participant feedback on your sessions at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute. It shows that your sessions on the Implementation Plans for Gifted Programs were successful, especially so considering the communication problem which kept states from attending as a unit. However, your session on the Utilization of Professional Organization for Gifted was not nearly as useful.

A. Implementation Plans for Gifted Programs

1. Sixteen of the 17 participants stated that you encouraged group discussion.

2. Sixteen of the 17 also stated they were either very familiar or had some knowledge of the session's topic.

3. Fourteen of the 16 respondents indicated that it had been a useful session. The form participants completed on the last day of the session also indicated that this was one of the most useful sessions. The comments that participants made are listed below:

This was the most significant session during the Leadership Training Institute to us in Minn. We were given much support and expertise by Bob.
Did not know I was to bring my team.
Good use of visual aids.
He is a great listener as well as teacher.
Review o.k. How about actual example of application of model.

It, for Illinois, was not what was planned, but we reported in different directions and did some good things.
Appreciated the overview of the various models.
Good for reminding us why we're here and what happens when we get home.
30 minute introduction? Content is general knowledge.
We got some things straightened out in teams.
Good to get teams together for discussion.

B. Utilization of Professional Organizations

1. Ten of the 12 respondents said you encouraged discussion.

2. One-third of the respondents were "very familiar" with the topic, one-third "not at all", and one-third somewhere in between.

3. Nine of the 11 respondents said it was useful. However, in comparison with the other sessions, the last day questionnaire would put it on the bottom of the utility ladder. There were only two written comments stating that the information was appreciated.

If you have any comments to make about your perception of the session, we would be glad to include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Chuck Alkire, Director
Region III Area Service Center
Box 2400
Illinois Central College
East Peoria, Illinois 61611

Dear Chuck:

The following feedback information is a result of the reimbursement panel sessions at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. Although seven participants checked that group discussion was encouraged and one checked "no", the majority either refused to answer or wrote "somewhat" on their forms. This seemed to be the only session of the institute where the vast majority of the respondents felt somewhat inhibited by the format.

2. Most respondents said they had some knowledge about the topic.

3. Of the 13 respondents, eight said the session was useful, three said it was not, and two were undecided. This session did not jell at all in comparison with most of the other sessions. The following comments may provide some insight:

   Really never keyed on process to develop programs...administrator dominated discussion.
   In general, the session seemed fragmental, with little continuity or connection... needed more structure and guidance from someone in charge.
   Wish you would have had a panel of kids who are participating in these programs.
   Another blowing own horn session "How great my school is" less terms and more workable understandable examples of how these schools became so great.
   Allow entire panel to participate.

Needed more "moderation" -- tendency
for some panel members to monopolize.
Too little talk about the students
and their reactions to the programs.
Too diverse, but informative.
I keep feeling that these people brought
in from the field are not being com-
pletely candid and honest with us re-
garding problems they are encountering
and degree of success and how "on
target" their programs have been. I
wonder about the criteria for selection
of panel participants.
Spectrum was limited.

Altogether, it seems that this session was one of the least useful for the participants. The last day summary questionnaire confirms this.

If you have any comments on the panel discussion, we would be glad to include them in the final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Leo Baudino, Director
Region V Area Service Center
1102 College Court, Room 116
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Dear Leo:

The following feedback is a result of the presentation you and June made at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. All ten respondents indicated that you encouraged group discussion and interaction.

2. The majority (seven) stated they had some knowledge of the topic and two were very familiar with it.

3. All nine participants who answered the question stated that the session was useful. The following two comments were made:

   Enjoyed mirror activity
   Wish your training program open to all teachers of gifted in the state, no matter what area

It seems apparent that you accomplished your goals in your presentation.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

75

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Dr. Joe Walker
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Joe:

The following feedback information is a result of your presentations at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. Eleven of the 15 participants felt that you encouraged group discussion or interaction, although the afternoon group was evenly split on this question.

2. Nine of the 17 respondents to the second question stated they had some knowledge of the topic, including all of the afternoon participants. Five stated they had no knowledge of it.

3. Fourteen of the 16 respondents stated that the session had been useful to them. Both negative replies came in the afternoon session. The following comments were made by participants. (I noted all p.m. comments.)

   Excellent.
   A little bit on Georgia, split off on identification, practices/problems for gifted selection (I liked that).
   Excellent -- comes over well and to the point. Got everyone involved!
   It was excellent to hear a knowledgeable person speak directly to the issue of giftedness. The most helpful session by far for me.
   Best so far.
   Very poor, no real preparation for the session. A great waste of time (p.m.)
   Very interesting, really (p.m.)
   Activity very interesting. Again needed concluding words linking activity to gifted program (p.m.)

It seems that you accomplished your goals for the session, given the time constraints placed upon you.

We would appreciate your concise comments on any aspect of the Illinois Leadership Training Institute, core staff, participants, your session, the evaluation, etc., so that we could include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

State of Illinois
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent

August 28, 1974

Mr. Donald Mitchell, Director
Region IV Area Service Center
700 Main Street
Carthage, Illinois 62321

Dear Don:

The following feedback is a direct result of the area service center panel presentation at the Illinois Leadership Training Institute.

1. All 23 respondents indicated that the speakers encouraged discussion and questions.

2. Apparently, the area service center concept had had some good discussion before Thursday, since the vast majority (17 out of 23) indicated they were knowledgeable or familiar with the concept.

3. This session hit the jackpot by pleasing everybody. All 23 respondents said the session had been useful. Some of their written comments follow:

   Excellent...Ponvik best speaker so far in institute
   Excellent...Chicago presentation given with true clarity and purpose
   Many ideas discussed relate specifically to a similar concept for regionalization recently implemented in Ohio which currently provide services for handicapped students. It is our goal to utilize these centers or vehicles in the development and implementation of a state plan for the gifted.
   By far the best session so far this week -- many fine ideas
   This helped my feeling about service centers become more solid.
   Among the best all week...well focused... specific...closely tied to programs for gifted

Very helpful...clearly stated...responsive
to group questions
Good...especially Rich Ronvik...articulate
and has something to say that is specifically helpful even if it is Chicago.
I really gained some practical knowledge
to take back to my administrators.
Very useful information...feel like a sponge
soaking up all this info!
One of the best sessions. Focused directly
on the questions of the workshop. Rich
Ronvik especially helpful and insightful.

The area service center concept is not an easy one for many people to catch on to. This session could have turned into a show-and-tell session as the reimbursement panel did, but instead, it seemed to motivate and educate the participants.

If you have any comments to make about your perception of the session, we would be glad to include them in our final report.

Sincerely,

Tom Kerins

Tom Kerins
Department for Exceptional Children
1020 South Spring Street
217/782-3575

TK:sc

cc: Chuck Alkire
Sid Slyman

Appendix G

ILLINOIS LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

DELAYED CONFERENCE FORM

Name _____ State _____

1. At the present time, are you actively involved in gifted education activities in your state? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Was the ILTI useful in furthering your objectives for gifted education in your state? ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If you answered "yes" to #2, did the ILTI have any impact on the activities in which you are involved? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, explain.

4. If you answered "yes" to #2, did the ILTI have any impact on your degree of involvement? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, explain.

5. In retrospect, could you have obtained any additional training or experiences at the ILTI? ☐ Yes ☐ No Please explain.

6. Comments: